

## **CITY OF BELMONT**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

#### **ACTION MINUTES**

**THURSDAY, JUNE 17, 2008, 7:00 PM**

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at One Twin Pines Lane, City Hall Council Chambers.

#### **1. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Parsons, Horton, Mercer, Mayer, McKenzie, Reed  
Commissioners Absent: Frautschi

Staff Present: Community Development Director de Melo (CDD), Assistant Planner Gill, (AP), City Attorney Zafferano (CA), Recording Secretary Flores (RS), Assistant Public Works Director Borrmann (APWD)

#### **2. AGENDA AMENDMENTS - None**

#### **3. COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments) - None**

#### **4. CONSENT CALENDAR**

##### **4A. Minutes of May 20, 2008**

Vice Chair Horton asked that the word "flumbago" be corrected to read "plumbago" in the second bulleted sentence on Page 8. Regarding the Emmett House item, RS Flores noted that Commissioner Reed had asked that his comments reflect that he preferred wood or wrought iron for the fence and that he felt the paint colors chosen were garish.

MOTION: By Vice Chair Horton, seconded by Commissioner Reed, to accept the Minutes of May 20, 2008, with the corrections noted.

Ayes: Horton, Reed, Mercer, Mayer, McKenzie, Parsons  
Noes: None  
Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 6/0/1

#### **5. STUDY SESSION:**

ADPW Borrmann provided the following updates on Public Works projects that have been of interest to the Planning Commission:

- Emmett House Rehabilitation – work has slowed considerably due to some issues with the contractor. A meeting was scheduled for that week to talk about moving forward.
- Emmett House Trees – She assured the Commission that before work starts again, proper protection will be placed around the trees so that the contractor does not work too closely to them.
- Ralston Avenue Median Landscaping between Cipriani and Lyle – a bid opening was scheduled for the following day and construction is expected to begin over the summer while school is out.
- 101 Landscaping on Ralston Ave. – the Planning Director had just set up a meeting to review the landscaping plans that have been prepared; that project should be moving forward.

##### **5A. Review of Street Signs at Signalized Intersections**

ADPW Borrmann summarized the staff memorandum, using photos of current and potential signs to

augment her presentation and asking for Commission input and recommendations. Responding to Commissioners' questions, she stated 1) that there is no cost difference between the two proposed signs since they are made in-house, 2) the signs are made of high-quality material with a reflective covering on top of metal, 3) the signs are being replaced because the current signs are small and not legible, 4) she had not seen any test data comparing the different color schemes, and 5) she did not know if the material is a 3M product.

Chair Parsons commented that when going up Ralston the white signs seem to disappear into the sky and do not seem to be as readable.

Commissioner Mayer noted that signs of this type around California are normally white lettering on green background and wondered if there is a State guideline or standard for consistency.

Commissioner Mercer commented that her husband, who is a materials chemist, has worked on the improvement of this product for 3M Corp. and their studies about visibility deemed that white is the most reflective and is most often used for the lettering. She did not see the point of the logo and felt that it resulted in the use of smaller lettering. She thought perhaps the signs at intersections where traffic is traveling fast should have larger signs and that they should make sure that none of the signs are located in a place where something else is out-glaring it, such as street lights. She favored the green with white color scheme, did not care whether or not there is a border, and thought they should get rid of the logo and use all of the space for writing.

Commissioner Mayer stated that his clear preference was for white on green with the finer font, the border was fine, and he felt that the logo lent a bit of character to the signs. They could increase the space by putting the logo either above or below the word "St."

Vice Chair Horton agreed that the green with the narrow font was more legible, she liked the border but suggested that the logo should be made the size of those on the white signs. Referring to the staff report suggestion that they pay attention to the sign on 6th Street that is on an arm, she noted that coming westbound on 6th from El Camino you can't see the sign on the left side because it's behind a tree. She suggested that they need to consider the fact that there is another Public Works project that has to do with street trees and that they need to make sure the signs are far enough out on the arm so they can be read as the trees mature.

Commissioner McKenzie felt that the whole idea is a positive move and an improvement for the City streets. He preferred the white on green background, unbolded lettering, liked the border, but felt that the logo is a distraction and gets in the way of the lettering, and that it is difficult to tell what it is.

Commissioner Reed felt that the green with white offered the best contrast, the size is a big improvement, the logo is a distraction and is too small to know what you're looking at at a distance, and liked the borders. His preference was #1 without the logo.

Chair Parsons noted that there are "Welcome to Belmont" signs everywhere but at the West end of Ralston and on the Alameda coming from San Carlos. He added that seeing logos on trucks doesn't always mean you're in Belmont. He thought the green with white was much more readable, the edge is fine but not necessary, and thought the logo a bit distracting but could live with the smaller one, and the bold letters made the letters too fat and difficult to read.

#### 5B. Review of Decorative Street Lights Program

ADPW Borrmann summarized the staff memorandum and asked for the Commission's recommendation on each element of the street light – the fixture, the mast arm and the pole.

Questions, responses and comments ensued as follows:

Commissioner Reed:

- What is the difference in the life span between a wood pole and a metal pole?

ADPW Borrmann: Had not seen hard data on the difference but a wood pole manufacturer's information said that the life span was between 30 and 70 years, depending on the environment, and that metal seems to work for 50 years. Regarding the strength of the wood vs. metal poles, the difference is the speed of

impact; a wood pole will not fall over if a vehicle going at a slower speed hits it whereas the metal pole is designed to fall over at higher speeds because you don't want a hard fixed object.

Commissioner McKenzie:

- Concerned that there were some biases mentioned in the discussion of wood vs. metal poles and felt they needed to be more specific in statements about falling down and wearing out. He believed that it depends on how they are treated.
- Does what Council approved in February apply to Old County Road, Ralston and all arterial roadways? If so, he could not think of another City-wide design decision that would have more impact on the personality of a city and its uniqueness and inherent beauty than changing all the light fixtures on all the arterial roadways.
- Why, if the Planning Commission is the design arm of the Council, was it not involved in inputting and recommendation and in the decision for the arterial roadways?
- Is it too late to change the fixtures being used on Old County Road? Is it too late for Ralston and El Camino or does everything have to follow that pattern?

ADPW Borrmann: The conduit installation on Old County Road is being done right now by PG&E so the street lights are being located based on this type of fixture. There's not a project currently planned for the Ralston and El Camino areas. CDD de Melo interjected that the Old County Road project is much further along because of the PG&E undergrounding project, but he believed the Commission still had an opportunity at this meeting to forward its input so that the Council/RDA can make the final decision on the economic development area as well as Ralston Avenue.

Vice Chair Horton:

- Are they proposing to change the acorn fixtures in the Downtown Specific area?  
CDD de Melo: He believed the project would entail replacement on an as-needed basis, but the DTSP amendment to allow these kinds of fixtures would then allow these new fixtures other than the acorn. He did not imagine that the project is going to take out an acorn fixture if it is in perfect working order – it would allow for a choice.
- The Economic Development Area overlaps the Downtown Specific Area. She would recommend a different kind of light for the Economic Development Area. The acorn design from 1994 isn't quite cutting it; would like to see a different look in the downtown.
- The extent of the arterial is not clearly defined in the report – are we going to go all the way from one end of Ralston to the other?

CDD de Melo assumed it would most likely be from the freeway interchange to 6th Avenue. That would be the logical starting point to make the transition to residential neighborhoods.

- On El Camino, CalTrans has lights in the median that we have no say about.

ADPW Borrmann: We would need approval from CalTrans and would need to meet their requirements.

CDD de Melo: They have been approved in San Mateo from Hwy. 92 almost all the way to the border.

- Is the same fixture proposed here or are we going to go through this with them again?

CDD de Melo: It's not the same exact fixture but it is a similar older lighting type of fixture.

Commissioner Mayer:

- Are there any energy-consuming factors to consider?

ADPW Borrmann: the City is using high-pressure sodium vapor, which is an energy efficient light. One factor is the spacing of the lights; if you wish to have an environment with a certain brightness some light fixtures are more efficient than others. The acorn is not terribly efficient and of the ones they looked at the teardrop is probably a bit more efficient than the Philadelphia style but the difference is almost inconsequential. The primary difference is that if you have a goal to have a certain amount of lighting it can really make a difference if you need to add more lights to achieve that lighting level. There is also discussion in the field regarding the use of LED lights for parking lot installations but the optics have not been worked out and the way the light is directed is currently not as efficient with the LED.

- Commissioner Mayer confirmed with ADPW Borrmann that the lighting on Ralston on the wooden poles and the acorn lights are really more ornamental than anything else.

Commissioner Mercer:

- Am I correct in understanding that the down lights are more efficient than the up lights, which is what the acorn is?

ADPW Borrmann: I was comparing the tear drop to the Philadelphia—the teardrop is just slightly more efficient. The spacing is affected by around 5'; if you would have a specified spacing of 150' with a staggered pattern with the teardrop you would need 155' with the Philadelphia fixture, also depending on the width of the roadway. With the acorn light you need lights on both sides of the street and probably with

spacing more on the lines of 75 to 100'

- What is the objective of the yellow lights that are used in Santa Clara?

Vice Chair Horton responded that the Lick Observatory requires them for that area..

Commissioner Mayer:

- Do all of these have the capability of having an attachment arm for hanging banners or baskets?

ADPW Borrmann: Yes

Vice Chair Horton:

- Do they all have a cut-off?

ADPW Borrmann: They are semi-cut-off for the teardrop and also for the Philadelphia. For the acorn, what I've seen is that they've put a hood on it, which just basically blocks the light.

- Are we talking about all tall poles or are we talking about any pedestrian kind of poles? Are we talking about 12' poles anywhere?

ADPW Borrmann: For the arterial roadway we were looking at a taller street light. One of the things I worked with the manufacturers on was a style of light that would be appropriate for both.

- Are we talking about a lower height pole in the Economic Redevelopment Areas? Can these fixtures all be on either height poles?

ADPW Borrmann: Yes

Chair Parsons:

- Since we have this project in place on Old County Road using the Philadelphia, are we plumbing them for water?

- ADPW Borrmann: That is not currently the plan.

There being no further question, Chair Parsons asked for comments. Since they were already committed to using the Philadelphia style down one main drag, he asked if there was a consensus to committing to that style for the remaining arterials. The consensus was that they are not. He then asked where they would want something different than the Philadelphia style. Commissioner Mercer's response was "everywhere else." She felt that if they decided there was a more efficient, more effective, more artistic program, she would want to use it on all the other arterials.

Commissioner Mayer said he liked the idea of monumental lights such as the Philadelphia or the teardrop in the major thoroughfares, but elsewhere, going down Ralston from 6th Avenue maybe they don't need something so monumental. He's always liked the wooden poles because he thought of them as something he'd never seen any other place. Since the acorns are already established in the downtown area he felt it would be ok to continue that motif in the rest of that area.

Vice Chair Horton stated that she prefers the teardrop with the 6' mast arm for the arterials. She felt it was a lot more work to maintain the wooden poles than the painted poles, and that it was really important in the redevelopment area that they all have the arms to hang baskets and banners, and that they should be plumbed in certain areas. She thought the acorn was a bad idea from a security standpoint because they don't put out the desired foot candles; a down light would be better. She stated that perhaps a shorter Philadelphia would be alright for pedestrian fixtures but did not like the 2' mast arm with little curlicues.

Commissioner McKenzie expressed that for years he thought the Belmont lighting design system – the lanterns, lanyards and wood poles on Ralston and the other arterials – was over simplistic, run down and behind the times. Then over the years he came to realize that they have a lot to do with the charm, warmth and the quaintness of this unique, small town in the middle of the Peninsula; they are a big part of the town's personality and he believes they are very fitting to the Ralston corridor and to the Notre Dame University setting. He finds them especially attractive in the holiday season when they're decked out with the big red holiday bows. He could see that they may cause some maintenance problems for Public Works, and felt that they could use a face lift, straightening and modernizing the lantern fixture with 21st century optics and luminary. He did not see that this possibility was given any consideration up to this point by Council or Public Works.

Commissioner Reed stated that the proposed lights seemed very Victorian to him, and did not feel that Victorian and Economic Development go hand in hand. He found the wood poles extremely charming and felt that they give a lot of character to the City and should be considered more seriously than they are.

Chair Parsons likes the wood poles all the way up and down Ralston and would like to see them everywhere in town. He added that it probably does not make sense on the El Camino and obviously will not happen on Old County Road and probably shouldn't happen on Harbor. He felt very strongly that the Alameda and Ralston are arterials and the light posts convey a small town atmosphere, one that's not big business, and not industrial and gives a residential feeling. He does not like any of the metal posts but probably the least offensive is the teardrop with the longer pole but that is not a good light post for this kind of community. He stated that it might work in the redevelopment district around the periphery but was not sure he would want it when walking through it. He also felt they ought not to pick a light fixture in the Redevelopment district until they see how it starts to develop so that future developers could have some say so they will fit with the character of their development.

Commissioner Reed concurred that it is difficult to pick a light fixture without knowing what the redeveloped buildings are going to look like.

Commissioner Mercer commented that it's clear that when looking at the history, Belmont is not a frontier town and is not Victorian and that their historic landmarks really are a contemporary version of the Spanish style. She did not feel that the Victorian or Philadelphia look is quite right. She liked the lanterns and would use them on all the arterials. She would have a downtown shopping area that might have something that's much lower, more pedestrian friendly and would stick with wood lanterns if that's what they wanted – wouldn't "flip flop" around by block just because a certain type of building is on a certain block – she would go for consistency.

Chair Parsons stated that it seemed to be a general consensus that none of the Commissioners like the acorns, and they do not want lights that reflect up to the sky. He suggested that a subcommittee be formed to include Parks & Rec. and Public Works to look at other options. This decision will affect the character of the whole city and he did not believe the Commission was ready to choose any of the options presented.

Commissioner McKenzie added that the Philadelphia was designed expressly for the city of Philadelphia and Philadelphia is not Belmont by any stretch of the imagination and is not the look we need.

CDD de Melo summarized the Commission's discussion as follows:

- The commission is not comfortable forwarding a consensus opinion that a certain type of metal pole, at least what was presented tonight, works within the section of Ralston from 6th to the Freeway, or El Camino Real from north to south, or around economic development target sites.
- Allow the Old County Road project to proceed, see how those poles get installed and how that arrangement works with the Philadelphia design. He did not believe the Council is committed to anything further than that at this point.
- He will report back to Public Works and City Council to stop at Old County Road, get some other recommendations before this body and perhaps a subcommittee before they make any further recommendations for the remaining areas.

Chair Parsons determined that there is a consensus by Commissioners that they like the idea of introducing some wood and keeping the character that is already in place for the remaining areas of the City. He also would like to see a change order to the Old County Road project to add plumbing to the poles around the train station and at Masonic and Ralston.

Commissioner Mercer added that Public Works should know that it is not that the Commission is in love with wood, but that there is a styling of the lanterns on top that nothing in the packet replicates. They are much more of a country style lantern as opposed to the glass ball kind of things, and it is possible that there is another product that might use a metal pole but still retain the country lantern effect.

Commissioner Mayer added that San Carlos has lanterns on top of their street lamps but they are not very nice looking poles.

5C. Preliminary Design Review - New Single-Family Residence on Vacant Lot on Alhambra Drive (Application No. 2008-0022)

AP Gill summarized the staff memorandum. He noted that the attached Tree Survey was received after the staff report was written. He confirmed for Commissioner Mercer that there are two lots that were merged, and that the applicant has worked with a staff member to locate other lots that are not dedicated open

space but these lots have not yet been identified. CDD de Melo noted that 1200 square feet are automatically conferred from a discontiguous lot onto the receiving parcel, with one of the requirements being that the sending parcel then becomes permanent open space via a conservation easement.

Jeff Rice, designer, gave a detailed presentation of conceptual plans for the lot, the Tree Survey and the proposed residence. He noted that Eugene Tan, owner, and Merdad Chavos, builder, were also available to answer questions.

Mr. Rice answered questions from the Commission as follows:

Is there any way to minimize the driveway? He described an alternative suggestion, which would require the elimination of the requirement for additional off-street parking spaces.

He explained how he calculated the overall height of the house.

Had he calculated the cubic yards of fill that will need to be taken out? He had not calculated it but knew it would be a lot and guessed at 3,000 cubic yards.

Had he calculated what percentage of the lot will be covered in hardscape between the driveway and the footprint of the house? He had not, but guessed at 20%, adding that the entire back half of the property will be left in its natural state.

Do the two 13' retaining walls have to be that high? He could do more terracing but that would then jeopardize the root structure of a large tree.

Eugene Tan, owner, thanked the Commission for reviewing his project and noted that they have instructed the designer that they want to keep the trees in the back and was open to any alternative plans that would reduce the amount of cut and hardscape.

Staff responded to questions from the Commission as follows:

Can open parking on the property be in the front yard setback if it is in front of a garage? Paving can be in the front yard setback but cannot be used for parking. A 17' x 18' box is allowed as long as it is completely within the property and is in front of the driveway and garage, and can count as two-car off street parking.. For the flat work they would require a temporary encroachment permit. Any raised structure like retaining walls would require a permanent encroachment permit through the City Council.

Do we allow split-faced concrete? If it is seen from the public right-of-way, it would have to be architecturally treated. Section 9.47 allows a split-faced block treatment to be used.

Is there a limitation on the height? The height limit is 6' if it is located within a setback. Located on a setback, it can be as high as 15'.

Comments from the Commission were as follows:

Commissioner Reed:

- The amount of hardscape on the driveway poses some problems. Liked the idea of potentially moving the parking to the front of the garage or removing some of the hardscape that is to the west of the garage.
- Loved the design and felt it would look great in that neighborhood.

Commissioner McKenzie:

- There are technical issues with this challenging lot but he liked the design of the house overall and liked the way they tried to build the house in steps working with the hillside. Believed they are on the right track.

Vice Chair Horton:

- Great job of stepping the house back into the hillside.
- Liked the way the driveway winds around.
- Did not like the high retaining walls that are there just to accommodate the driveway.

Commissioner Mayer:

- Liked the look of the house very much.
- Problems are in dealing with the provisions of the General Plan, which talk about avoiding development on slopes more than 30% intensity and should decrease in steepness as distance from thoroughfares increase. Not sure if the lot is developable given those criteria.
- If it is to be developed, he liked what they've done but concurred with the other Commissioners in terms of hardscape.
- Could make Findings 3 and 4 but had problem with 1 and 2.

Commissioner Mercer:

- Liked the design of the house and thought it was perfectly suited for the setting.
- Could make Finding 1 that it is appropriate land for housing, and the density would be appropriate provided they are given 3 lots with one house.
- 3000 yards of cut is a "show stopper." Suggested that they consider detaching the garage to get it further out towards the street.
- Thought it was odd that they have a bathroom for every bedroom but no closets in the bedrooms.
- Would have a hard time approving it as is because of the amount of cut.
- Would expect to include a condition to include an engineered drainage system that would find a thoroughfare underneath and to the side of the lot leading into the Alhambra drainage.
- Could not make Finding 3 that the approach to designing the new residence is to minimize grading and to preserve the forest.

Chair Parsons:

- A soils study would be needed.
- General Plan says not to try to build on steep lots. They did take into account the City's design criteria which talks about stepping it up the hillside; the problem is getting up to a driveway.
- Did not understand why they put parking beside the garage and then also paved the area in front. His thought would be to bring the driveway up the way they did – the two spaces could be right in front of the garage and that two-spot parking shown to the west of the garage and the paved area in front could go away, the hillside could go on up and they could actually bury the garage in the ground at that point and not have to cut all of that land where they're trying to put parking and paving. If they need a second retaining wall they could step it further back and also hide some of the walls behind the hillside that would stay there and they could actually put the garage under ground.
- Concerned about the amount of cut that will be necessary and the amount of hardscape.
- Only issue with the design would be all the glass sun rooms that would light up at night. Not sure the neighbors would be pleased with that. Also questioned if it meets Title 24 requirements.
- Also suggested that there might be a way to move the garage further to the south and not have to go that far back into the hillside.
- Concerned about the amount of cut and fill on those retaining walls and suggested that they look at the house to the south of them – when they look at those walls he felt the Planning Commission made a mistake and he did not want to see more of that in the neighborhood.
- They have a beautiful site and want to preserve as many trees as possible. He believed they could keep a lot of dirt in front of their property too if they work in that direction.
- Could not approve it the way it is.

Vice Chair Horton added that the trees they are showing for mitigation trees are too closely planted and they would end up having to take some of them out later. Chair Parsons added that the City allows them to pay for trees by putting money into a tree bank for the City – they do not have to put them all on their property. Vice Chair Horton suggested that they could be planted in the median strip on their street.

## 6. NEW BUSINESS:

### 6A. Selection of Two Commissioners to Emmett House Committee

CDD de Melo stated that the purpose this subcommittee would be to work with City staff to streamline the action items that are required to come back to the Commission – the final landscape plan, gate plan, exterior colors and tree disposition.

### 6B. Selection of Two Commissioners to Sign Ordinance Amendment Committee

CDD de Melo stated that the function of this committee would be similar to that of the Noise Ordinance subcommittee that was convened in 2005-2006. It would include two members of the City Council and two

Planning Commissioners, as well as staff and perhaps even some consultants. CA Zafferano added that it was the suggestion of the City Council to start work on a revision of the Sign Ordinance. The key issues in the Sign Ordinance have less to do with particular details of signs than they do with adopting broader policy decisions relating to size and placement of signs in different zoning districts.

After discussion and a phone call from Commissioner Frautschi, it was agreed by unanimous voice vote that Vice Chair Horton and Chair Parsons will serve on the Emmett House subcommittee, and Commissioners Mercer and Frautschi will serve on the Sign Ordinance Committee.

#### 6C. Determination of Conformance with General Plan – Vacation of Public Right-of-Way – Portion of Civic Lane (Land Adjacent to Assessors Parcel Numbers 045-244-010 and 045-244-160)

CDD de Melo summarized the Staff Report, recommending approval of the Determination of Conformity to the General Plan.

Commissioner Mercer expressed her concern about delivery vehicles parking on El Camino Real if/when the entire block of Fireside Square is developed, stating that if she is going to vote to give away the alley she needed some assurance that when they get down to the detailed design the underground areas are going to be designed for adequate delivery access.

CDD de Melo responded that for the current project there will continue to be access. Looking at future phases of the development, if the balance of the El Camino Real-fronting properties becomes developed with similar style and size of buildings, that will be an issue they will need to address. There is undergrounding that is being considered for parking which could be designed with some sort of delivery truck refuge area. He concurred that it is a very real operational issue and he imagined that the underground could most likely accommodate a van of some sort for deliveries but not a large truck. He added that if the concept plan for the parking garage underneath the balance of the El Camino Real-fronted properties gets built there will be allowed an opportunity for cars to go all the way in, turn around within that drive aisle in the garage and come back out on O'Neill, or they might be better served to have an alternative access point on El Camino Real. He stated that it is an issue to be aware of and they will make sure that it is addressed, but for this one project access will continue to be available for the other properties.

MOTION: By Commissioner Reed, seconded by Vice Chair Horton, to adopt the Resolution Determining that a Request to Vacate a Portion of Civic Lane Right-of-Way Adjacent to APN 045-244-010 & 045-244-160 Conforms to the Belmont General Plan.

Ayes: Reed, Horton, Mercer, Mayer, McKenzie, Parsons  
Noes: None  
Absent: Frautschi

Motion passed 6/0/1

## 7. REPORTS, STUDIES AND UPDATES

CDD de Melo reported as follows:

7A. Motel 6 – 1101 Shoreway Road  
Should be having a meeting with the security detail within the next two weeks.

7B. NDNU (Koret) Athletic Field  
Had forwarded the Acoustics Study, which is now a public document, on Friday. Comments could be forwarded to staff, but that document has now been forward to the Athletic Field Task Force. The next action will be to get that group together to continue to talk about the Conditional Use Permit.

7C. Charles Armstrong School – 1405 Solana Drive  
He has sent out email requesting dates to talk about the school. He had not yet heard from the school regarding their preference dates. As soon as he hears from them he will put together a meeting.



7D. Ralston/US-101 Landscape Project

He sent an email meeting request for Friday, June 27th, to meet with the CalTrans architect. They have a revised plan ready to go with a quasi blessing from CalTrans.

Chair Parsons reminded staff that it appears that some of the rings around the trees on either side of Safeway need to be removed because they are starting to impact the growth of the trees.

8. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 2008

Liaison: Commissioner Mayer  
Alternate Liaison: Chair Parsons

9. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:31 p.m. to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Tuesday, July 1, 2008, at 7:00 p.m. in Belmont City Hall.

---

Carlos de Melo  
Planning Commission Secretary

CD's of Planning Commission Meetings are available in the  
Community Development Department.

Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.